



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ASSYRO-BABYLONIAN <sup>amél</sup>TU.BÎTI.

By A. H. GODBEY,  
The University of Chicago.

Johns, *ADD.* II, p. 106, in discussing this officer, inclines to the view that he is not a temple official of any kind, but merely an occupant of temple lands, charged with certain dues to the temple. This opinion he would support by reference to royal endowments of the temples, in which connection the <sup>amél</sup>TU.bîti is sometimes mentioned. But this is inconclusive. Such connection with temple-endowments may imply nothing more than the modern pastor's connection with the manse and glebe, or parsonage, or parish house. There is further the objection that in the Cultustafel of Sippara, also mentioned by Johns, the most important provisions for the reorganization of the temple services are made *kî pî* <sup>amél</sup>TU.bîti, "according to the instructions of the TU.bîti." Further, instead of being taxed for the maintenance of the temple, provision is made for his support. He receives five shares of the daily receipts as against two shares received by the *naš paṭri*. In H. 167, K. 582, rv. 17, *sqq.*, we may compare the daily allotment for a *mašmašu*, four shares, and for a *pirḫinu*, two shares. There is also an <sup>amél</sup>TU.bîti II-u in the Cultustafel, a species of classification improbable in the case of mere tenants or taxpayers. We also find <sup>amél</sup>TU.bîti who do not appear to be connected with the temple, and are probably palace officials. In various places we find them spoken of in a way that suggests high rank. I do not see how to reconcile the various data, except upon the theory that the TU.bîti was a great official. Accepting the reading *erēbu* for TU as the key to the solution, we may find him to be the <sup>amél</sup>ša pāni ni-ri-bi, as written syllabically in H. 875, Bu. 89-4-26, 71, obv. 7. This may be preferable to the reading *ērib bîti* cited by Johns. That *nirib* rather than *ērib* is used in reference to the entrance of a structure of any kind, is shown by numerous passages; cf. *HWB.*, p. 127. That we must understand the officer in question to be something more than a mere porter or janitor, at least much more than is expressed by our modern conceptions

of, and associations with these terms, will appear from the following data.

In H. 512, K. 528, we have a letter that is suggestive. The writer does not state his office, but, though addressing the mayor of the palace, he does not call him "my lord." Such mode of address clearly indicates that he is of higher rank than the recipient of the letter.

Order of Nabû-zêr-lîšîr to the mayor of the palace: (Admit) <sup>m</sup>Nabû-šarḫû-ikîša; <sup>m</sup>Zêr-Ištar, a chief repairer(?) (*HWB.*, 527, Johns, *ADD.* II, p. 174; Van Gelderen, *BAS.* IV, p. 532); <sup>m</sup>Ubbâ (one Arabian)(?) a palace employee (son of the palace); <sup>m</sup>Mûšurâ (one Egyptian)(?) a palace employee; the wife of the rab-mâti (mayor of the palace); three sons of <sup>m</sup>Nabû-zêr-lîšîr; the wife of <sup>m</sup>Nabû-šarḫû-ikîša; two daughters of <sup>m</sup>Nabû-zêr-lîšîr, (and) his daughter-in-law.

The 8th day of Tammuz.

<sup>m</sup>Nabû-zêr-lîšîr to (any) son of the palace.

Total, fourteen persons admitted.

It would seem that we here have an ancient pass ticket. The writer furnishes an order of admission to various persons who wish to enter the palace enclosure. Addressed primarily to the mayor of the palace, it is countersigned at the bottom, authorizing admission by any "son of the palace" who may be on duty at the gate when the ticket is presented. The note was written rapidly, the determinative *amêlu* being omitted in some places; and hence there is uncertainty about the third and fourth names in the list. The plural sign is omitted throughout, and there is an error of two in the total as the letter stands in Harper's text. It is to be noticed that six of the persons mentioned are members of the writer's family, and one is the wife of the mayor of the palace to whom the order is addressed.<sup>1</sup> Two persons are palace officials of some type. It would appear, then, that even persons prominent in the social circle of the palace required, if they had been outside its precincts, a special order for their re-admission, and that there was a person authorized to issue such tickets; perhaps an *amêl ša pâni nîribi*.

In H. 511, K. 654, we have a letter from a man of the same name, Nabû-zêr-lîšîr, written, however, in the Babylonian script. He reports a number of things—garments, gold, silver, horses, sheep, etc.—for Abu-êrba "of the king's seed" and his

<sup>1</sup>The cases cited by Johns, *ADD.* II, p. 157, make it appear that *rab mâtî* and *rab êkali* are equivalent titles.

wife, all of which seem to be consigned to his charge in the palace (dib-bu na-aš-ru-ti ša <sup>m</sup>Nabû-zêr-lišir ina êkalli du-bu-ub). If this person is the writer of H. 512, we should have some further suggestion as to the rigid supervision he would exercise over everything entering the palace.

H. 475, 83-1-18, 3, is a short but suggestive letter, probably from Ibašši-ilu, written in the Babylonian character:

To the king, my lord, thy servant (Ibašši-ilu). May Nabû and Marduk be gracious to the king, my lord. Referring to Iddin-aḫû, and Ina-ḫîbi-Bêl, his brother, the TU.bîti: According as the letter of the king my lord gave orders to me, viz., send them those carpenters—now I will send them unto the king my lord.

Apparently the two officers named have made a requisition for carpenters for some purpose, and the king has sent word to Ibašši-ilu to supply the needed men. The inference is natural that alterations or repairs of the temple may have been under the supervision of the TU.bîti, and this inference we shall find supported by other data to be cited. The two officers named also appear in another important rôle; cf. *infra* H. 496. In the meantime we may compare the change in organization made by Joash, 2 Kings 12:4 *sqq.* It is to be observed there that so long as the chief priests, those officiating about the altar, handled the temple receipts, the house of Yahweh was in bad repair, and there were no available funds. Only when the matter was taken out of their hands and placed in charge of "the priests, the keepers of the threshold," was the house put in proper condition. The system adopted, the subdivision and distribution of priestly functions, is an interesting parallel to the Assyrian method. Modern critical views upon the relative importance and the chronological priority of priest and Levite may require a slight modification. Some such assignment to special duty would be necessary in the nature of the case, even though all alike were called "the priests, the Levites." 1 Chron. 9:17-29, will be reflected in the further study of the TU.bîti.

It would seem that the <sup>amêl</sup>TU.bîti was prone to make alterations in the temple interior without consulting anyone. The letter H. 493, 83-1-18, 13, is from Ašur-rišûa, a priest of Ninib, who is not pleased with what has been done. The purport of this broken letter is clear enough. During the reign of the king's father the TU.bîti of Ninib had altered the golden orna-

ments of the head of Ninib. At the time of writing, a company of workmen are employed in cutting strips of silver from the walls. The priest begs that the king will stop the work, and remarks that he himself has not been consulted, though he thinks himself "their brother" in such matters. With this we may compare H. 468, Rm. 217. Some Babylonians complain to the king that Ħulala, a TU.bīti of Šamaš, has come down and carried off "a sky<sup>2</sup> of gold" from Êsagila. What action the priests took with reference to the matter is illegible. Some of the people are incensed, and say that they are no longer safe; that they will be made like the city of Gana. Such stripping of costly decorations from temples, to beautify Assyria, may have been one of the causes of Babylonian revolts from Assyrian domination.

To these evidences of the authority of the TU.bīti in the matter of repairing or altering the temples, we may add Rm. III, 105, a broken cylinder, published by Winckler, *AOF.* I, pp. 256 *sqq.* It comes from the period of civil war in Babylonia, near the middle of the eighth century B. C. The inscription is of one Nabû-šum-imbi, who tells us that he is a nišakku and a TU.bīti of Nabû, as well as šāḫû (Winckler, NIN.ku) of Borsippa. He records his restoration of the temple, which was damaged during the civil war. Nabûšumiddina, a son of Dainī-Nabû, and a TU.bīti of Nabû, had made a night attack upon the temple in Borsippa, which Nabûšumimbi was holding with an armed force. The pious Nabûšumimbi prayed to Nabû until sunrise, and as a result the enemy were beaten off. The successful combatant expresses his gratitude to Nabû by repairing the temple.

Passing from this relation of the TU.bīti to the repairs or alterations of the temple, we find another interesting feature of his office. Iddinaḫû and Ina-ḫibi-Bêl, two officials already mentioned in H. 475, appear in this important function in H. 496, K. 474. Ibašši-ilu writes to notify the king that the third of Elul is the day for the arraying of Bêl, and that the opening of the great gate of the temple takes place upon the fourth.

<sup>2</sup>AN. E., the usual mode of writing šamê in the letters. I doubt its being a plural of "God," as this would not be in accord with the epistolary usage. Moreover, Êsagila is the residence of Marduk, and we should hardly expect miscellaneous idols therein, judging from the complaint against Nabonidus in the Cyrus cylinder. Further, would an official of the Šamaš cult have use for images from the Marduk temple? He would, of course, have use for the gold.

Iddinaḥû and Ina-ḫibi-Bêl, the TU.bîti are, as the king knows, the persons properly in charge of those ceremonies. The writer asks that they be sent, and that they may stand with him on the day of the opening of the gate. It is probable, then, that they were expected to pass upon the dress of the worshipers as well as that of Bêl, when they stood with Ibašši-ilu. The position of Ibašši-ilu himself I do not know. In other letters of this group, HH. 496-501, we find him reporting that the king's orders for beds, coronets for Anû, and other temple fittings, have been filled. Since the data already given show the TU.bîti to be connected with such matters, and since in the letter under consideration Ibašši-ilu wishes two well-known threshold-keepers to stand with him on the great day of the opening of the gate of Bêl, he may have been such an official himself. He may also be identifiable with one of two men of his name prominent in Thompson's *RMA*.

These suggestions concerning the functions of this official recall the Cultustafel. Col. V, 26 *sqq.*, specifies, "and furniture of the interior<sup>3</sup> according to the instruction of the two <sup>amēl</sup>TU.bîti-MEŠ." The king's share of the daily expense (*cf.* 2 Chron. 31:3) is the food for the priests, and "two shares according to the instructions of the two <sup>amēl</sup>TU.bîti;" then follows the list of clothing provided. Special garments are required for the seventh of Nisan, the tenth of Iyyar, the third of Elul, the seventh of Tîšrit, the fifteenth of Marchesvan, and the fifteenth of Adar: altogether six festal robes each year given by the king. The interesting features in these details are the evident authority of the TU.bîti, and the fact that the third of Elul requires a special festal garment for the servitor of Šamaš, as it does in the letter last quoted for the servitor of Bêl. In H. 338, 82-5-22, 98 Mār-Ištar also discusses ceremonies for Bêl and Marduk upon the third of Elul, and the opening of the gate is mentioned (*cf.* Van Gelderen, *BAS.* IV, p. 533). We may compare with these specifications for particular garments upon occasions of unusual significance, Jehu's order: "Bring forth vestments for the priests of Baal" (2 Kings 10:22). In the twenty-third verse is an order for special scrutiny of the assembly, that only duly qualified worshipers may be within.

<sup>3</sup> U-na-at lib-bi is not translated by Jeremias, *BAS.* I, p. 275; *cf.* u-na-a-te ḫurāḡi kaspi sipirri parzilli iḡé u abnē ēpuš, from an Ašurbānīpal inscription, cited by R. F. Harper, *HEBRAICA*, X (1894), 198.

This may be parallel to the request of Ibašši-ilu that the two wardens may assist him in the great gate upon the festal day. In Ezekiel's code we observe that the priests must leave their vestments in the side chambers, not being allowed to come among the laity wearing their official apparel (Ezek. 42:13, 14; 44:19). The Levitical code (Exod. 38:4) will readily suggest itself; but till we know precisely what the Babylonian or Assyrian robes were, we cannot undertake a comparative study of Jewish and Mesopotamian priestly apparel. But it seems clear from the cuneiform data so far that the great guardian of the threshold was responsible for the proper preparation of every one who would enter the temple. Only thus could the perfection of each rite be guaranteed (observe the conditions and reservations in the oracles of the Sun-god); and only thus could the temple be kept free from defilement. The post was no sinecure, and we shall see that the warden needed to know all that occurred within the temple as well as what was approaching from without.

Our data also allow the conclusion that the average temple had two chief officers of this type; and this may imply two gates of the temple in daily use, besides the great gate opened upon special occasions when the presence of the king was expected. We observe that there are two threshold keepers in the Cultustafel; two are called for by Ibašši-ilu; in the narrative of Nabûšumimbi two rival threshold keepers are warring for the possession of the temple; in the Cultustafel one of the two officers is an <sup>amêl</sup> TU.bîti II-u. We may venture the suggestion, then, that Ezek. 44:1-4; 46:1-3, 8-12, give us some idea of the arrangement of a Babylonian temple (*cf.* also 1 Chron. 31:14 for "the porter toward the east") and of the movement of the throng upon a festal occasion, under the supervision of the TU.bîti. Further questions concerning the arrangement of the Babylonian temple will be considered in a separate paper. For the modification of Ezekiel's plan see Josephus, *Ant.*, XV, II, 5, and 1 Chron. 9:17-28.

As showing the familiarity of the TU.bîti with all that occurred within the temple, the letters of Akkullanu are peculiarly interesting. This writer is shown in H. 539, K. 17, rv. 14, 15, to be a TU.bîti of the temple of Ašur. In H. 16, K. 428, in a brief report to the king, too broken to be intelligible, he is associated with Adadšumušur, Arad-Êa, and Ištarsumêreš. This places his activity in Esarhaddon's reign, a fact further supported

by H. 43, K. 122. His prominence will be more clearly realized when that of his associates is remembered. Their activity is noticeable in the excursus upon the Esarhaddon succession. The letters of Akkullanu, HH. 42-50, 429, 678-681, suggest that he is the proper person to address for information upon almost any matter connected with the temple, or its service.

H. 42, K. 14, has been translated by Van Gelderen, *BAS.* IV, p. 518. Akkullanu reports that on the third of the month (Elul again?), Ašur and Bêlit went forth in peace and returned in peace. Goblets and drink for the king have been duly prepared, and rites which had ceased through neglect have been re-established; but the šuraru-wine for the month Tišrit has not been provided for Ašur. The chief vintner, his deputy, and his secretary have alike neglected the matter.

The next letter, H. 43, K. 122, is the most interesting of all. Van Gelderen, *BAS.* IV, p. 513, has given a translation, and Johns gives a general view of it, *ADD.* II, p. 105, and a complete translation *ABLCL.*, p. 377, changing his former view slightly. In both he differs somewhat from Van Gelderen. I am not sure that the reverse of the letter is perfectly understood. But the bearing upon the duties of the TU.bîti is in no wise affected. In the first part of the letter, he replies to an inquiry of the king informing him of the governors, cities, and provinces that have neglected to send the regular offerings to Ašur. Nineteen are named; and as several of these are certainly provinces outside of Assyria itself, we may have a sidelight upon the unwillingness of the Hebrew prophet to see his king maintain either hostile or dependent relations with Assyria.<sup>4</sup>

The reverse of the tablet reports the facts concerning two priests (Van Gelderen, "scribes"), who had been consecrated by Sennacherib, but had lost their positions through some ceremonial mishaps, "not great sins." One is "priest of the bake-room,"<sup>5</sup> shaved when he was young. The other is chief of the larder, or almost a "head-waiter" for the temple tables. Each seems to have been deposed for some inattention to proper shaving

<sup>4</sup> Compare the frequent complaints concerning rebels in the cuneiform historical inscriptions. "They had had not sent to inquire after my peace—they scorned the solemn oaths by the great gods."

<sup>5</sup> With this priest of the bake-house, compare the little cooking chambers flanking Ezekiel's temple (after Babylonian models (?)), 46 : 19-24, and the chambers and those in charge of things baked in pans, 1 Chron. 9 : 31 ; 23 : 28, 29 ; Lev. 2 : 5-7 ; 6 : 21 ; 7 : 9.



(ina la šaḥ-sa-su-te la gal-lu-ub).<sup>6</sup> Thus apart from the information the letter gives concerning the TU.bīti, it is of interest as suggesting some exacting ritual of the Assyrian priesthood. Apparently, cuttings of the "corners of the head and beard" were seriously regarded. As for the TU.bīti, he is evidently expected to know the past history of the temple as well as current events. One would infer his familiarity with the temple library, or record room. The record of the neglect of stated sacrifices by certain governors recalls the frequent complaints of the Hebrew narratives, and the list of nobles bringing offerings,<sup>7</sup> in Numb. 7.

H. 185, K. 1396 is interesting after this report concerning delinquent governors. Nabûbêlšunu tells Ašurmudammik that he has been wronged by Akkullanu. The latter has obtained twelve or thirteen mana of silver from Ašurmudammik, for the breaches of the shrines of Ašur and Bêlit. Nabûbêlšunu tells his friend to make a memorandum of it, and to plan for its recovery. It would seem that Akkullanu, when charged with repairing the temple, was inclined to somewhat vigorous measures for securing the necessary funds.

H. 44, K. 604 gives us no information. Akkullanu asks the king for a reply to a previous letter. In H. 45, K. 691 he announces that he will "bring to Dilbat" (?) an axe,<sup>8</sup> pilaḫḫu that has been called for. It is probable that some sacred symbol,

<sup>6</sup> For shaving the head as part of the ceremony of consecration to the priesthood, compare Ašurbānīpal, L<sup>3</sup> 12, 13. Observe the many cylinder-seals and reliefs in which a shaved person is brought before a god, *e. g.*, the DeClercq collection. The appendix to Curtiss, *PSR.*, 268, by Wm. Hayes Ward, gives a number of illustrations. Notable are figures 3, 7, 10, 17, 19. A fully appareled priest wears a queue, sometimes plaited, sometimes turned up behind, or decorated. As an unclean person must keep from the altar in general Semitic usage, we must regard these scenes as illustrating consecration or purification. Some of the figures may represent females, but some are certainly shaved males. Compare the shaving of the Levites when consecrated, Numb. 8:7; the shaving of the head of the Nazarite as a mode of cleansing, Numb. 6:9, 18; cf. Acts, 18:18; 21:24; shaving of a leper for cleansing, Lev. 14:8, 9; 13:33; Egyptian shaving of one coming to court, Gen. 41:14; the shaving of Egyptian priests mentioned by Herodotus, the prohibition in the case of Hebrew priests, Lev. 19:27; 21:5; Deut. 21:12; Ezek. 44:20. On general subjects see A. R. S. Kennedy, *DB. I.* p. 536; Carslaw, *DB. III.* p. 478.

<sup>7</sup> These duties of Akkullanu suggest the inventory clerk, and Ezekiel's familiarity with all costly merchandise (Ezekiel 27:1-25). Was Ezekiel a priestly threshold keeper, becoming in consequence, familiar with all kinds of articles likely to be brought before a god?

<sup>8</sup> We may think of the double axe, Greek *πέλεκυς* as contrasted with the *ἡμιπέλεκυν*, now familiar from excavations of the Cretan Labyrinth, which bears traces of Semitic influence; the double axe (or mace) in the hand of Ištar (?) on some seals (Ward, appendix G, to Curtiss, *PSR.*, fig. 7); the lance, as emblem of Ninib, as evidenced by *kakka b šukudu*, *kakkab tartaḫu*, and the upright lance upon his (?) altar, DeClercq, 308, 371, 373; the double trident (thunderbolt (?)) in the hand of Marduk when assailing Tiāmat in various reliefs and seals; the bow of Ašur in reliefs and historical inscriptions and O. T. reference to worship of military emblems, Hab. 1:16.

or piece of temple furniture, is here referred to. Both letters have been translated by S. A. Smith, *AL.*, and Delitzsch, *BAS.* I, p. 222; II, p. 30.

In H. 429, Rm. 69, translated by Van Gelderen, *BAS.* IV, p. 530, Akkullanu is again concerned with the decorations of the temple. A golden tablet, a peace offering from the king, is missing. Akkullanu reports that it has been seen in the possession of a jeweller(?), and that he will institute a rigid examination of the man before a scribe. That the ornament came safely to the temple from the king's messenger is doubted, and this person should be questioned. Perhaps the same subject is discussed in the badly broken H. 592, K. 1116. Of the fourteen original lines, not one is left entire. We can recognize some reference to a golden tablet and a jeweller.

In H. 47, K. 979 Akkullanu announces libations and royal sacrifices at Tarbiši, and asks the king if he should attend them (*cf.* R.F.Harper, *HEBRAICA*, X, 1894, p. 196), adding that the king cannot complain this time of not being duly notified. In H. 48, K. 1019, and H. 49, K. 1168, the breaks are too serious to allow any connected narrative; both, however, may refer to the same subject. In H. 48, Akkullanu says: "Regarding the priests of the city of Aššūr(?), about whom the king sent to me, I will myself inquire of some priest . . . ." H. 49 is much longer, and begins, after greetings, "As to that priest about whom the king, my lord, sent to me, he made complaint from his heart three times on that day." The next twenty lines are too fragmentary to yield any connected sense. About the middle of the reverse we find instructions for ritual on certain days; on the tenth day at noon a censer; on the eleventh and twelfth, great sacrifices (*niḫê*). There follows a report concerning a complaint made by the priest of the Temple of Seven at Nineveh, about whom he had sent word to his lord the king. The son of some priest of the Temple of Šamaš has been asked for; his name, Akkullanu says, is Zari, son of Nadinapal.

The next letter of this group, H. 50, K. 1242, broken also, refers to sacrifices before which Akkullanu stands. Sumerian ritual titles are discernible, and *tamarti* of Sin and Šamaš are mentioned. HH. 678, 680, 681, are too fragmentary to be of value, but H. 679, 83-1-18, 61 is interesting as being a purely astrological report. Star movements are discussed at some

length, though nearly half the letter is broken away. We may question if the writer is the same Akkullanu as above. Bezold thinks there are two. Yet knowing the dominance of astrology in Assyrian thought and ritual, it would seem that all the learned classes and priestly authorities should have some general knowledge of the subject, as it would be impossible otherwise for them properly to perform their daily functions. This is supported by Thompson's *Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers*. Nos. 81, 259 are from a rab dup-šar; Nos. 109, 266, from a rab A. BA.; No. 160 from a dup-šar; No. 58 from the rab A.ZU; No. 83, 115F, 183, 243, from a maš-maš. There is a fair presumption then, in favor of some astrological knowledge upon the part of the TU.biti. It is practically confirmed by H. 401, 83-1-18, 30, in which the king writes to Zêru'a and the TU.MEŠ.biti of Dûr-ilu, that the month Adar has an excess, and that they must adjust its calendar. The various astrological reports from Akkullanu in Thompson's collection, and the two other similar reports in *HABL*, need not then be assigned to some other than our temple warden, as Bezold conjectures.

Whatever we may conclude as to the warden Akkullanu's connection with astrology, the passages cited indicate that the TU.biti was a very powerful official. That his position was one of great honor may be fairly inferred from the case of Nabûsum-imbi, previously cited. A nišakku, and šâḫû of Borsippa, he would have us know that he is also a TU.biti of Nabû. Perhaps it is for the purpose of maintaining his right to this position that he battles with Nabûbêlšunu. Akkullanu's activities and associations suggest high honors. We may add from Nergl. 13, "Nabûsumukîn, the TU.biti of Nabû and šatammu<sup>9</sup> of Êzida, spoke to the king Neriglissar thus: Give me Gigitum, your virgin daughter to wife."

Some further texts must be noticed. In the large inscription of Merodach-baladan II one Ina-ḫibi-Bêl is mentioned as a ḫazânu. Is this the person above mentioned as a TU.biti by Ibašši-ilu in HH. 475, 496? For ḫazânu is a term sometimes

<sup>9</sup>The šatammu kept the šutummu or "storehouse," to which the TU.biti assigned valuable property, and from which the ḫêpu drew the supplies which he loaned out when handling the temple revenues. Compare the šâ-tam bit u-na-ti on Boundary stone 103, col. IV, 9, with the u-na-a-ti of the temple in Note 3, supra, and the amêl šâ-tam of the amêl TU.biti of Marduk in VA. 451 (*KB*. IV, p. 172). The term seems Babylonian rather than Assyrian. In Strassmaier's contracts we sometimes find the šatammu furnishing grain and money from the temple stores. He is occasionally mentioned in connection with the ḫêpu.

applied to the TU.bîti. In H. 65, K. 629 (*JEL.*, p. 153.), Nabû-šumiddin writes to the mâr-šarru. The functions shown in the letter are those we have already observed. The writer announces that the temple of Nabû will be opened on the third of Iyyar. The couch of the god will be consecrated (for this ceremony see K. 164, *BAS.* II, p. 635); the god will return on the fourth; sacrifices are announced, and the route of the sacred procession is given. All may enter the temple who bring one 1/2 of food. The writer calls himself the 1/2 of the temple of Nabû. In H. 366, 82-5-22, Nergal-šarrâni writes of a like event; the temple opening on the third of the month and the god returning on the fourth to the couch. The 1/2's connection with the ceremonies is noted. In H. 419, 83-1-18, 24, we have a joint letter from the šangû II-u and the 1/2. In H. 49, 83-1-18, 13, the 1/2 of the temple is expected to aid in stopping certain alterations. The other 1/2 passages in the R.F. Harper letters refer generally to city officials. Such may be observed in the historical inscriptions and in the Tell el Amarna letters (*cf.* Zimmern, *ZA.* VI, 248). Winckler, *AOF.*, 246, argues that the title was originally that of the prefect of a village or petty district. But the ideogram for 1/2, NU.BANDA, is common in early cattle accounts in the E. A. Hoffman collection (Radau, *EBH.*). The 1/2 there is only a common herdsman. In early Boundary stones, II R. 43, III R. 41, the 1/2 is a household officer. The inference is that the word 1/2 has no restricted technical sense; that it is merely "overseer" (*ZA.* VI, p. 349), and can in consequence be applied to various functionaries. The inference finds support in the Jewish use of the borrowed term. Four 1/2s are distinguished in Jewish literature; (1) the 1/2, or mayor, of a city; (2) the 1/2, or sheriff of a court of justice; (3) the 1/2 of the temple (the "porter" of 1 Chron. 10:26-29) who had charge of the robes, treasures, and utensils and who aided the priests in robing and disrobing (*cf.* the Arabic 1/2, "treasure-keeper"); and (4) the 1/2 of the synagogue, whose functions may be regarded as a survival of those of the temple 1/2. (For particulars see, *Jewish Encyclopædia*, VI, pp. 284 *sqq.*)

Considering the very definite character of the reports we have examined, coming from the TU.bîti or 1/2, we may fairly conjecture, when we find such reports of the order of services

coming from one who does not mention his office, that the writer is the official under consideration. Thus we may conclude that Nabûpašir who writes H. 134, K. 1234, and Nabûkudurûsur, writer of H. 858, K. 822, are such officers.

Compare with the data so far given the account given by Curtiss, (*PSR.*, chap. XII) of the sacred classes in modern Syria. "In addition to the care that the minister takes of the shrine he is repository of such legends as may exist with respect to the origin of the shrine, and the life of the saint whose names and deeds are celebrated." This suggests the Cultustafel.

In S<sup>b</sup> 77, 4, we read of an *akîl kisalluḫi*, or "vakeel of the anointed ground." Perhaps this is the early equivalent of TU.bîti.

The passages cited inevitably raise the question, What was the relation of this officer to the *šangû*? For we have found a *šangû* complaining of alterations made by a TU.bîti. Akkul-lanu gives us nearly all the information derivable from the letters concerning the *šangû*. The latter appears the less conspicuous personage because the matters treated do not fall within the range of his official activity. He may have been influential in popular intrigues, as he is mentioned in two or three reports of governors and military officers, and it was deemed advisable to place two sons of Esarhaddon in the most powerful priestly offices of the empire. While the TU.bîti clearly supervises the general procedure within the temple, we must not conclude that the *šangû* had no field of his own in which he was final authority. We must regard him as the personage who officiated at the great altar upon the solemn occasions when the keen-eyed and fully-appareled TU.bîti stood in the great gate and carefully inspected the incoming worshipers. The religious texts published suggest the domain of the *šangû*.

From the evolutionary standpoint both officials are certainly descended from the primitive custodian of the sacred shrine, the Arabian *kahinu*, the Hebrew *cohen*. The cuneiform literature affords some data for the history of their development. Neither is known so far in the older inscriptions. We have in them the term *patesi*, sometimes translated "priest-king," and comparable with the Semitic *sheikh* of a petty district, who may also be the custodian of its sanctuary. This translation has been fairly questioned. Budge and King (*AKA.* I, p. xvii; cf. Jensen,

*KB.* III, 1, 66) would interpret its use by early Assyrian kings as indicating their subjection to Babylonian secular domination. It may as plausibly be construed as showing that there was then little religious differentiation from Babylonia; and Lehmann (*BAS.* II, p. 614) has shown that the early rulers of Shirpurla use it regularly, whether they were independent or vassals. Moreover, in Assyria they are patesis of gods, not of other princes. In the Hammurabi period the patesis are clearly a sacred class. In *LIH.*, 42, we read of one man libbi mârê bârê, and four libbi mârê patesi; in *LIH.*, 17, we have two men libbi mârê patesi and one libbi mârê bârê. This pairing "the sons of the seers" with "the sons of the patesis" recalls the seers or "sons of the prophets" and "the priests the Levites" of the O.T. In *LIH.*, 43, we learn of a sharp protest made at the drafting of a patesi for corvée service. The recipient of the letter is given to understand that the patesis are exempt from such service. We must understand this exemption to be upon religious grounds; we cannot suppose that one secular governor had seized his confrère for corvée service. Compare Ezra, 7:24. In *LIH.*, 91 a šangû of Anunit is included as one of the patesis of Anunit. This form of statement makes us think that the šangû is appearing as a subdivision of the patesis. In *LIH.*, 38, a patesi in the service of one officer wishes to be transferred to the employ of another. The king directs that an exchange be effected and that the employer see that the patesi's field is properly cultivated for him (*cf.* Neh. 13: 10-13). This is extremely interesting, as suggesting that the patesi class was not yet concentrated at a few great temples, but that many were household priests like Micah's Levite in Judges 17. It would also appear that Hammurabi is endeavoring to control the distribution of the patesis; the *LIH.* letters show also that he looked after the temple revenues. The grouping of patesis with seers, bârûti, by Hammurabi, should recall the references to visions and a seer-goddess by the patesi Gudea, Cylinder A.

This same distribution of the patesi class is shown us a thousand years later. Boundary stone No. 105, III R. 41, records the sale of a piece of land. In the list of curses we find one that is unique: an imprecation upon him who shall ignore this deed of sale and present the land to any god, or king, or patesi of a king,

or patesi of a šaknu, or patesi of a bīt tēmi. Remembering how frequently we find the kings seizing lands and setting them aside for various temple servitors, we may suspect that patesis, in the days of Marduk-nadināḫi, B. C. 1115, were not universally admired, and that they were to some extent household priests, as the data above would suggest: and that the term in the boundary stone is still a general one for shrine functionaries of any kind. Furthermore, we find documents of the later periods showing sacred personalities holding two or three leading offices: as Nabū-šumimbi, already cited, is both nišakku and TU.bīti. And the ability of a man to establish his household shrine and priest is shown by documents like BW. 88-5-18, 704, cited by Johns, *ABLC.*, p. 223, in which Nūr-ilišu dedicates to a god one SAR of land, and decrees that Pī-ša-Samaš shall be its priest, Nūrilišu himself laying no claim to the priesthood. This is an excellent parallel to the case of Micah (*cf.* Nbd. 773). One or two passages in the religious texts may support this view of the patesi as a religious functionary instead of a secular "deputy." Marduk is the well-known mašmaš ilāni: the incantations of the mašmaš ilāni are sometimes called for: in his name evil is adjured to leave. But in *DES.*, p. 168, "E" 41, Ea tells Marduk, "perform for him the incantation of <sup>ilu</sup> pa-te-si-MAḪ." In *DES.*, p. 34, "By <sup>ilu</sup> Pa-te-si-GAL.ZU.AB be thou exorcised." Is the "Great Purifier," Marduk, the PATESI.MAḪ? The second reference seems to be to Ea.

In Babylonia the title patesi persists to the end, the title TU.bīti appearing as early as the time of the Cultustafel. But since the restoration described there is "according to the instructions of the two TU.bīti," and since this office tended, as we shall see, to be hereditary, we may fairly conclude that the office existed, and that its functions were fixed before the destruction of the temple by the Suteans, several centuries earlier. It may even date back to the days of Ḥammurabi, since we have found the šangū known at that time. The TU.bīti appears in other familiar documents of the time of Nabūpaliddin, to be mentioned presently in connection with the hereditary character of the office.

But in Assyria the title patesi soon disappears. It is claimed by Irišum, B. C. 2000, who is called centuries later a šangū of Ašur (Scheil, *Rec. Trav.*, XXI, 1900); by Šamši-Adad and Išme-Dagan, B. C. 1850-1800. Tiglathpileser I. accords these two the

same title, VIII, 2, 3. Pudû-ilu, B. C. 1350, calls himself iššakku of Ašur, the equivalent of patesi. Adad-nirâri, his son, calls himself iššakku of Ašur in one inscription, and šangû šîru of Bêl on a stone tablet; he is in this inscription the son of Pudûilu the šaknu of Bêl, iššakku of Ašur; grandson of Bêl-nirâri the šangû of Ašur, great-grandson of Ašur-uballiṭ, whose šangûtu was glorious. Can this varied terminology mean that the chief priests of different divinities originally bore different titles, arising from the different rites prominent in the cults? Šangû is, up to this point, reserved for the servitor of Ašur or Ištar. Ašur-rêš-iši, 1140 B. C., is šangû of Ašur, and gives the same title to Mutakkil-Nusku and Ašurdân, his predecessors. Tiglathpileser I. claims the office. Ašurnâsirpal, in his various inscriptions, is šangû of different gods; Ašur, Ištar, Bêl, Ninib, and Nergal. (See *AKA.*, pp. 182, 189, 198, 205, 209; *Annals* I, 25.) In K. 868 he is išipu nâ'du nibit Ninib. Evidently he has become "commander of the faithful" of all the more prominent cults. The Sargonids emphasize their šangûtu of Ištar. But Sargon himself, evidently a religious reactionary, revives the phraseology of Pudu-ilu 600 years before. In the Nimrud inscription he is šaknu of Bêl, iššakku of Ašur: he repeats this on numerous bricks. This is certainly irreconcilable with the theory that patesi or iššakku, when used by an Assyrian king, implies his subjection to Babylon. In some of these brick inscriptions we have his title more fully: šakan <sup>ilu</sup>Bêl, iššakki <sup>ilu</sup>Ašur šakkanak <sup>ilu</sup>Nabû u <sup>ilu</sup>Marduk. This supports the suggestion that the chief priests of certain gods may have had distinctive religious titles. The šakkanakku of Babylon would appear to have been the vicegerent of Nabû and Marduk.

We may wonder if these royal claims indicate functional activity, or mere honorary headship. We do not hear of an Assyrian king claiming for himself the honor of TU.bîti. He would think of himself as officiating at the altar instead of "keeping the charge of the house." But Neriglissar, placed on the throne by priestly intrigue, tells us that he is the son of Bêlšum-iškun, the wise prince, the perfect hero, nâšir maššarti Êsaggil u TIN.TIR.KI. (Budge, *PSBA.*, 1888, cylinder; col. I, 11-13.) Is the king boasting of his descent from a TU.bîti? In Assyria, did the temple officials, who, in their letters, frequently used the phrase: "We keep the charge of the



king our lord,"<sup>9</sup> think of the king as a šangû whom they assisted? Esarhaddon's favorite oracle, we know, was that of Ištār of Arbela, sometimes spoken of as Bêlit parši. He declares that Ištār of Arbela is a goddess, ra'imāt šangûtia. In opening salutations Adadšumušur (and occasionally others) frequently writes, after greeting the king, a-na pi-kit-te ša Bêlit parši šul-mu a-dan-niš. Does he think of the king as the great šangû of Ištār, and therefore include in such salutations "those who kept the charge of the house" of Ištār? Questions like these are natural in connection with the subject, but answers just now would be premature.

Reference has been made to the efforts of various kings to guarantee the maintenance of certain temple officials by freeing certain lands or persons from royal taxation, the revenues being instead devoted to the temple service, and the produce of the lands going into the temple stores, when it was more than could be immediately consumed. The term zakku, "dedicate," secures this exemption from secular demands. The chronicler may be copying this scheme in 2 Chron. 31:13-19. Exemptions for sacred classes are specified in Ezra 7:24. But the records of such royal grants raise the question of heredity, the land so consecrated being sometimes spoken of as previously consecrated by a former king, and later reverting to the royal domain. An example may be cited in K. 4467, published by Johns, *ADD.*, I, 714. Meissner, *MVAG.*, 1903, III, p. 6 *sqq.*, collates it with K. 1989, and 83-1-18, 425, and Bu. 91-5-9, 193. Sargon narrates in this deed his restoration of land originally set aside by Adad-nirâri to supply the granaries of Ašur. Ninety-five imêru of land in the fields of the city of the TU.biti, in the campus of Nineveh, are reconsecrated. The land is given in charge of the sons of former temple servitors. Fifteen imêru of ground are set aside for the rab akalê, "like the field of the city of the TU.biti—with the field of the governor of Dûr-Šarrûkîn I counted it—fifteen I thus consecrated." This placing of the lands of the temple servitors upon the same footing as the land of the governor should be compared with Ezekiel's land system, 45:1-8, and endowed state offices in the Haran census.

Since the benefice is given to the descendants of former beneficiaries, and the TU.biti are spoken of as though owning or

<sup>9</sup> The frequency of the similar expression in the Old Testament should be noticed: Gen. 26:5; Exod. 6:13; Numb. 9:19; 27:23; 1 Chron. 9:27; 2 Chron. 8:14.

dwelling in a city, or definite territory, and since Akkullanu, in H. 43, speaking of a deposed priest, then dead, recommends his son for the vacancy, the fact of heredity in sacred offices, and the existence of Levitical cities, is clearly shown.<sup>10</sup> In this connection we have some interesting matter. VA. 208 of the Berlin Museum (*KB.* IV, p. 94) is from the 22d year of Nabûpaliddin. In it Bêliddin, son of Nabû-zêr-iddin, the TU.bîti of <sup>ilu</sup> La-gamma-al and šakû of Dilbat deeds to his second son his right to the entrance fees of flesh of different kinds. In another document, much damaged, from the 20th year of Nabûpaliddin, we find Nabûpaliddin, son of Abua, grandson or Aḫar-Nabû, the TU.bîti, complaining that he has received but part of the land held by his fathers. His petition in the case is granted (*KB.* IV, p. 92). A very interesting case of transfer appears centuries later. It suggests that the hereditary line of temple wardens may have been threatened with extinction. A TU.bîti adopts a son, and transfers to him a right to 6 ḳa of food and 6 ḳa of drink, a fourth interest (zittu) in the flesh of offered oxen, and an interest in the table of the god (zitti paššûri). This document is dated in the first year of Barzia (VA. Th. 123, 124; *KB.* IV, p. 296). We should not infer that the entire TU.bîti-u-tu is transferred by this document, for we have another, showing partial sale. It comes from Uruk, from the time of the Seleucidae, (*KB.* IV p. 313). The seller holds the TU.bîti-u-tu of Bêl, or at least a one-sixth interest in it. He sells for one mina five shekels of silver "one-sixth of the day" upon the 16th, 17th, and 18th days, forever, with all right to the purchaser to do as the seller would have done, with the receipts of the "sixth of the day." As the document is dated the 27th of Nisan, and no month is named in connection with "the 16th, 17th, and 18th days," we may infer that those days of each month are implied. Comparing this with the announcement of Nabûšumiddin, already noticed, H. 65, K. 629 that the entrance fee upon the festal day will be one ḳa of food, we may perceive how very profitable the wardenship of a large temple might be. The document just cited is one of the earliest cases of simony or speculating in pew-rents on record. But though heredity in sacred offices is shown by the documents cited, they also show that it was subject to modifications, as in Palestine.

<sup>10</sup>This question of the city I discuss in "The Semitic City of Refuge," *Monist*, October 1905.

The above transfers of TU. bīt-u-tu may be compared with transfers of other sacred offices. Thus, in the fourteenth year of Nabūna'id, 84-2-11, 61, *ABR.* II, p. 20, Nabūbalaṣṣuikbi bequeaths to one son the "dagger-bearership" (GIR. LAL-u-tu) or position of official slaughterer in the temple of Ešarra, and to another son the income of the shrine of Papsukal in the temple of Bēlit-šamē-eṣṣiti. In MAP. 41, we find in the days of Rim-Sim a suit involving the right to five days in the year in the temple of Nannar, sixteen in the temple of Bēlit, and eight in the shrine of Gula. In Bu. 91-5-9, 2175 A is discussed the right to act as šatammu, for six days in the month, in the temple of Šamaš. And such priestly offices could be held by women, or transferred to them: the "dagger-bearership" above mentioned Nabū-balatsuikbi states he had formerly assigned to his mother. We may conjecture that during her tenure of the benefice a hireling performed the work. Such rights to temple receipts on certain days may lie behind the rotation service of the Levites in the Chronicler's scheme.